#### REMARKS

Claims 1-34 are pending in the application and stand rejected. By the above amendment, claims 1-19 have been canceled without prejudice.

# **Drawing Objections**

A formal set of drawings was filed on May 10, 2007. This objection is thus moot.

#### **Specification Objections**

The specification is objected to for having "small text font size" on pages 19-20. However, pages 19 and 20 of Applicants' specification as filed do <u>not</u> appear to have any "small text font size". In this regard, this specification objection is unclear and requires clarification, otherwise the objection should be withdrawn.

# Claim Rejections

### 1. Anticipation

- (a) Claims 1-9 and 26-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Horvitz (US Patent No. 6,260,035).
- (b) Claims 1, 20, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Messinger (US Patent No. 7,000,187).
- (c) Claims 1, 20, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bala (US Patent Application No. 2004/0130572).
- (d) Claims 10 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mayuzumi (US Patent No. 6,134,644).

# **B.** Obviousness

(a) Claims 10-19 and 30-34 are rejected as being unpatentable over <u>Horvitz</u> in view of <u>Harel (U.S. Patent No 6,384,843)</u>

(b) Claims 20-25 are rejected as being unpatentable over <u>Horvitz</u> in view of <u>Sullivan</u>

(U.S. Patent No. 6,615,240).

Applicants respectfully traverse each and every anticipation and obviousness rejection set

forth in the Final Action. Applicants presented a very detailed, persuasive explanation regarding

the legal and factually deficiencies of the claim rejections in Applicants previously filed

Amendment. The Examiner has responded with essentially the same rejections which

Applicants respectfully contend are premised on unreasonable mischaracterizations and

interpretations of the prior art teachings as applied to the claimed inventions, which renders the

claim rejections legally deficient as a matter of fact and law. As such, Applicants have filed a

Notice of Appeal along with a Request for Pre-Appeal Brief Review with an accompanying

Statement setting forth a concise explanation as to how the claims rejections are clearly

erroneous as a matter of law and fact, which is incorporated herein by reference.

Respectfully submitted,

/Frank DeRosa/

Frank V. DeRosa

Reg. No. 43,584

Attorney for Applicant(s)

F. Chau & Associates, LLC 130 Woodbury Road

Woodbury, New York 11797

TEL.: (516) 692-8888

FAX: (516) 692-8889

6